

**SPECIAL MEETING  
COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY AND TRAFFIC**

**August 22, 2006**

**6:45 PM**

Chairman Osborne called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Osborne, O'Neil, Shea, Roy, Long

Messrs:       Dep.Chief Simmons, Dep.Chief Leidemer, K. Clougherty

Carol Johnson, Deputy Clerk, stated item 3 is relating to the purpose of the special meeting to review crime prevention recommendations enclosed. We also would note that there was a distribution of an additional letter from Captain Lessard to be addressed too.

Chairman Osborne stated I thought it would be great if we could just take about half of these proposals, probably, this evening, and cut it in half and probably do half of them some other time. I don't think we can get through fourteen different proposals in one evening. There's something else I wanted to discuss just a little bit, but what does the Committee feel about this?

Alderman O'Neil stated I'd like to see us kind of at least touch on some of them, because although we won't take any action tonight, I think we need to get people to start thinking...maybe not a lot of debate about it but...

Chairman Osborne asked what would be your recommendation? Which ones would you like to talk about?

Alderman O'Neil stated I think all of them are important. I think some of them, for instance the first one, the reserve officer, that's in the works...in the works in the sense of trying to iron out everything with it. I don't think we should spend a lot of time on it tonight because...

Chairman Osborne stated the first three we shouldn't spend too much time, right?

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm okay with that. I'm working off Deputy Leidemer's letter of August 15<sup>th</sup>. So I would agree with you that the first three we could skip over for right now because they're...

Chairman Osborne stated okay, which one would you like to take? Start off, Alderman O'Neil.

Alderman O'Neil asked would it make it easier to go in order?

Chairman Osborne stated that's fine. I just thought maybe you wanted to add or talk about...

Alderman O'Neil stated I personally think one of the most important things we can do right now is this Neighborhood Enhancement Team. I know there's a meeting been set up, but I think that could be one of most critical actions we take as a City over the next few months and continuing on. Many of you, especially Aldermen that represent some of the various inner city wards, this is a major item. I think the key to this is, there needs to be somebody from – I don't care what department – a strong leader, to make sure that actions are carried out, and that this isn't a feel good that sits down once a month and says, we went out and visited ten buildings. I mean, Alderman Shea keeps reminding us that the quality of life is what it's all about for a lot of these people. So I don't know where that particular item is. They reference as a meeting set up, but I don't know if it's happened, etc. So do you want to start there?

Chairman Osborne stated that's fine.

Alderman O'Neil stated and that kind of follows up on what you talked about with the Building Department last month.

Chairman Osborne stated and I also brought up the landlord situation too.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know if Police can update us on where that's at.

Glenn Leidemer, Deputy Chief of Police, stated Aldermen, we have a meeting set for Wednesday, August 30<sup>th</sup>. I believe it's ten o'clock in the morning. All the Departments listed in my analysis addressing the Neighborhood Enhancement Team. Everyone is on board. I question the need to have someone appointed to coordinate/oversee the unit. It's not a committee, per se, where we're not going to meet and discuss what needs to be done. The meeting has been convened to explain what our goal is and how we're going to accomplish our goal, and then

we're going to go out and do it. If an Alderman would like to be present, or someone from the Public Safety and Traffic Committee would like to participate in that meeting, I would certainly extend that invitation to them. But this is going to be a working unit. It's not going to be a committee.

Alderman O'Neil stated I understand that. My concern is that all the Departments approach this with the same effort; if a Department says they're going to follow up, there needs to be somebody that drives that. And I don't know that it's any one Department's responsibility. We worked with Alderman Shea earlier this year. Your Community Policing Division took an effort down off of Beech Street. They were kind of the driving factor, and to be honest with you, not all the Departments were coordinated, and it took some continuing push by the Community Policing Unit to make sure that the Departments got on board to help solve a problem. That's my concern. To me this is a very critical item and I just don't want to see it...everybody's out doing their own thing. It needs to be very coordinated. Everybody who's representing each Department listed needs to buy into this. When there is a targeted property, everybody hits it together. Everybody does their follow up, because there's various statutes that govern responsibilities of each department. I'm not questioning the Police Department on this. I'm just saying it needs to be a coordinated effort in the City for it to be effective.

Deputy Leidemer stated I think I understand your concerns but I would suggest that at least give us the opportunity to go out. The purpose of the meeting the 30<sup>th</sup> is to do just that: explain what our goals are. To use your words, to have the Departments buy in as they have in the past, and it's going to be a working unit, not an oversight committee.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think that's...I'm pleased to hear that.

Deputy Leidemer stated we will go out as a unit. Every Department that's in that analysis will go out as a unit. Each has a different role and responsibility and a different level of jurisdiction, if you will. And each will carry out their jurisdiction and we will work together, work collaboratively to achieve the goal of exactly what the NET Team is meant to do.

Alderman O'Neil stated thank you.

Chairman Osborne asked anybody else?

Deputy Leidemer stated if anyone has any interest, I can certainly extend the invitation for the 30<sup>th</sup>, and I can email if you would like to sit in on the initial meeting.

Alderman Long asked so is it safe to say that after the 30<sup>th</sup> there will be a comprehensive plan in place as to where you're going to go, how it's going to run? I understand it's a working unit and I think that's what it needs to be.

Deputy Leidemer stated everything that you and Alderman O'Neil suggested, except where we're going to go. I think that will be established the 30<sup>th</sup>, the 31<sup>st</sup>, early September. We're going to hit the ground running, but I don't know if when we meet as a group on the 30<sup>th</sup> we're already going to know where we're going. That will be part of the discussion process. But I can assure you during the meeting on the 30<sup>th</sup>, we will certainly know what the goal is and how we're going to accomplish that goal. We're not quite sure where we're going to go our first stop. We will work that out amongst the participants.

Alderman Long stated very good, thank you.

Chairman Osborne stated why don't we take on the commitment of the Board, adding ten new officers to the complement in the next two years. Anybody have anything on that?

Alderman Roy stated I'll be the first to open up this conversation. The adding of ten new officers was a suggestion of the Mayor's office. I think it is related in the Deputy's letter that the FBI Uniform Crime Report reflects the national average of officers, per one thousand people, is two point three (2.3). So I think we're somewhat kidding ourselves if we're looking at the 215 officers that we currently have, 193 that are actually available for active service, and feel that a commitment of a low amount is going to accomplish what we would like to accomplish. I think that it would be prudent for this Board to ask the Solicitor to draft an ordinance that bases the uniformed officer position is based on our population. It takes politics and budgeting out of the complement, and I think it should be a number that slowly, over the next five to ten years, gets us to the FBI standard. And I'll put that out as a suggestion to this Committee, to ask the Solicitor to go ahead and put language together for an ordinance that, if we increase by 10,000 people, we increase by 23 officers, using that ratio.

Alderman Shea stated I'm not sure exactly whether I agree or disagree with that situation at present, but I think that one of the problems that the police department probably has is the fact that they know pretty much how many officers, realistically, budgetary-wise, they can probably achieve. The problem is that they don't really know who's going to retire or who's going to probably be on a leave of absence, and so forth. And I think that, from the Police point of view, I think that they probably have to try to – and I don't think you can do it contractually because the school does it. They say if you retire in the year, say 2007, you have

to notify the Superintendent by a certain date. But I think that there has to be something so that the Chief and you people as administrators have a hold on how you can manage your departments realistically with the number of personnel that you need in terms of handling the problems that exist in the City. And I know that Alderman One has sort of hit upon the situation as far as how many police officers the City of Manchester realistically by FBI statistics needs. But I think that, unless you have a firm grasp on where you stand with the personnel that you now have and what their disposition might be, what their intentions might be, it's pretty difficult to start recruiting people when you don't, from one point of view, have the necessary information that you need and possibly you don't have the financial resources that you might need in order to pay severance and all the other things that go along with it. So I think that there probably has to be some sort of an in depth study within the Police Department in order for you folks, who are the leadership there, to get a grasp on where you're going to stand in the year, say 2008, 2009. That's from my point of view. That's how I would reason things out. And I think that from the point of view of the Police Chief and others, when they appear before the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, they really have to say, look, we need these people. We can't get along without them. We need them. In other words, the plea has to be, look, if we don't have the necessary personnel, we cannot do the job that you people expect us to do. And this has to be given to the Aldermanic Board. And when the Mayor makes out his budget or when the Aldermen make out a budget, this is what they have to do. That's the way I see it. As far as the amount of people, it changes. You may have today, he said 193. You may have 189; you may have 196 right now. I mean, I don't know. It's like hitting a moving target all the time. You're shaking your head and saying, yeah, you're hitting it right in the head, you know.

Deputy Leidemer stated well Alderman, we certainly understand what you're saying, and there's some merit to what you say. Part of the problem we see right now is, even having an upward...increasing the complement to 215, we're currently...tomorrow we're scheduled to run over boards from our most recent test. So we have to first bring us up to the 215 and then factor those retirements and resignations and perhaps long-term disabilities and leaves of absence into that. But right now the important part is to have a budget that matches the allotted complement and then allow us the opportunity to do the recruiting for the officers that we've been given, the complement that we've been given.

Alderman Shea stated so the points that I raised probably are very important.

Deputy Leidemer stated they're certainly things that have to be factored in.

Alderman Shea stated that's right.

Alderman O'Neil stated one of my concerns...I certainly applaud my colleagues that were looking at increasing the complement. I think that's a great move. My concern though is we don't exactly have people knocking down our doors to be police officers. There used to be a period of time we'd test once a year and end up with a satisfactory pool to put through the Academy, or if they were certified people...I don't know how many times in the past twelve months you've tested, but two or three maybe.

Mr. Gary T. Simmons, Deputy Chief of Police, stated this last one I believe was the third one in the past year.

Alderman O'Neil stated and you didn't have big numbers, I don't believe.

Deputy Simmons stated no, I believe the last time we had about 135 applicants. This time we had 68. And of those 68 we're down to, I think, twenty-four.

Alderman O'Neil stated that's on the written test and the physical agility, which they know what the requirements are ahead of time. And you're already down to how many, Deputy?

Deputy Simmons stated to twenty-four, and we'll lose some tomorrow.

Alderman O'Neil stated we can talk about numbers and I think Alderman Shea's point about budget and getting them the right budget is important. But I think we may want to ask the HR Department to look at, where is the pay for our Police Officers? We're not attracting...and I don't think this is a Manchester issue. I think this is just a law enforcement issue in general.

Deputy Simmons stated yes, I think you're right, Alderman. In general you're seeing that all across the country, as a matter of fact. It's somewhat cyclical. When the economy is decent and the private sector is paying well and everybody is comfortable, less people are going into police work. Federal agencies have been hiring people, but in general police departments are losing a lot to backgrounds, to physical agility testing, to just not passing a basic written test. So it is across the country.

Alderman O'Neil stated so maybe we can ask the Administration to work with HR, just to take a look at, where is the pay for our police officers? We never have been the top paid police department in the State, even with the new contract, I don't believe. And there's always somebody that's paying a little better than us. I think you've done a good job retaining people. We've had a significant number of retirements recently, so I'd suggest that the Administration work with HR to look at, what can we do to attract more people and get them to stay?

Chairman Osborne stated as far back as I can remember there's always been a complement of four or five officers always needed, even back in the early 80's. They never had a full complement. There was always some missing. You can't be 100 percent. When's the last time that you had a full...right up to snuff.

Deputy Simmons stated I think about two years ago we were at 100 percent for about two days – something along those lines. At the end of this month we'll have five vacancies.

Alderman O'Neil asked weren't you at pretty full like at the last swearing in or when they had accepted the job and then the same two week period, I don't know, five or six retired?

Deputy Simmons stated yes.

Chairman Osborne stated I think the whole answer is not so much the starting salary with an officer. I don't think that's going to make the big difference. If you're going to give them an extra fifty dollars a week or a hundred dollars a week, whatever it is, I think that's not the whole answer. I think if somebody wants to be a police officer, they want to be a police officer. That's the main thing. If it's in your blood, it's in your blood. If it's not, it doesn't matter what you're going to pay. They're not going. So that's my outlook of the whole thing.

Alderman Roy stated I do agree with you that if you want to be a police officer it is in your blood, but when we are competing against every other town in New Hampshire, every city in the east coast, if our pay matches that competitively, those who want to be police officers, whether it's New York, Boston, or Manchester, if we're giving them quality of life and giving them a proper pay scale, I think they'll choose Manchester for quality of life. That being said, at the last meeting and referred to this Committee on Public Safety, was a letter that I wrote to the Board and I'm somewhat looking forward to responses because two of my suggestions had to do with starting pay and overall pay. So I would like to reiterate that. Like the Mayor's letter, if we could get a breakdown of your response from the Department's standpoint on those suggestions...I believe mine and Alderman Lopez's would be greatly appreciated. And we'll touch upon some of those suggestions later on, but I for one, when it's looked at and we discuss budget issues, and we discuss our complement, I'd like everyone to keep in mind that if we have a one percent downturn in our multi-family or residential tax base, in our revaluation that we just went through, we're required in five years to do another one. And it will most likely be statistical. If we have a one percent downturn in that tax base, it will cost us teachers, firefighters, police officers. So if we're not proactive with our crime, we're going to pay for it either now or later.

One way or another, the taxpayer will pay for it. I'd much rather pay for it now by increasing the budget or working with the Department to find other savings and increasing the complement to prevent crime than reading in the weekend paper about beatings and shootings and - you know - many, many violent crimes that I think if we had people on the street, we could avoid. So we will pay for it one way or the other.

Alderman O'Neil stated I would just like to make a motion so they have something formal to work with, so the Department can work with HR to look at the pay and etc. for our police officers. I don't know when the last time... Yarger-Decker certainly looked at it... When's that? Ten years ago now. Just to see where we are, what other cities and towns in New Hampshire are paying; what some of the larger cities around New England are paying. Just to give us a feel for where we're at. We may be competitive. We may not be.

Alderman Long stated briefly, also with the consideration, I mean not only the pay but also what's attracting certified officers to other areas. I know there was one with respect to his town was giving a subsidy for going on his wife's insurance so the town wasn't picking up his insurance. He was getting fifty or a hundred dollars a week, so with that added on, where Manchester didn't give that, it wasn't attractive for him to come here. So, any enticement that you feel would add to bringing in certified.

Deputy Leidemer stated I think adding in to what Alderman O'Neil said, we'll just take the liberty and do an analysis of incentives, pay scale, anything that revolves around what would induce someone to come here.

Alderman O'Neil stated that is a true story, though. You had somebody as a finalist, certified already, but the community he worked in had some incentive, and it's a business decision that that community made, and that was the determining factor in that police officer leaving. Am I correct on that?

Deputy Simmons stated I don't believe we had him yet. He was an applicant, if I'm not mistaken, and we lost him to another agency before we picked him up.

Chairman Osborne asked Deputy Simmons, in the smaller towns in New Hampshire, do you find that they're having a hard time as much as you are?

Deputy Simmons responded probably more so in that we can, when we have a vacancy of four or five, we can absorb that somewhat and deal with it a little easier. Some of the smaller towns, yes, they're definitely losing people. They're not getting their same applicant pool because they're smaller. One thing Manchester certainly has is we have a variety of opportunities available to

someone who wants to be a policeman. We have so many different factions, so many different divisions and opportunity. Some smaller agencies don't always have that available to them.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Long, it was voted that the Administration Division of the Police Department work with the Human Resources Department to review the pay scales, benefits and incentives for City of Manchester Police Officers.

Chairman Osborne stated what I'd like to do now is I'd like to just talk about a little something here that I was going over today and that's Crimeline. I think this is one of the better deterrents to crime in the City of Manchester. I think it's been let down a little bit in my own view. I thought of everything from an increase of monies going for Crimeline, \$2,500 to \$5,000. I'm not saying this is what I'm proposing. I'm just talking here. But if you take from the beginning of Crimeline, there's been 2,964 cases. Multiple arrests, there were 3,250. There was 932 rewards for a pay out of \$191,000. Now, recovered things, this is just an estimate: property \$1,611,130; cash \$435,405; and drugs \$4,824, 577. That's quite a record, I think. And I think what's out there now as far as – everybody thinks I like signs – but the signs that are out there now need some work. The Crimeline signs are getting deteriorated and then we have... not the Crimeline. Excuse me, that's the Neighborhood Watch signs. I think if we could increase...I'm just talking to the Committee now a little bit...if we could increase some of the signs, which would be a very inexpensive way of educating the neighborhoods and the people who think they want to do a crime, I think the more you educate and the more you can get out there and be heard, the better off you are. Money is not always the thing. I think you can attack this from a different way. I'm very heavy on this Crimeline thing. I'd like to see more signs, probably thirty more Crimeline signs – from thirty to sixty – there's thirty out there now. That's not enough for the City of Manchester. And the Neighborhood Watch signs, there's thirty out there, so if we come up with another ten or twenty. Anything to just increase in certain areas like Valley Street or Beech Street or up on Somerville Street or wherever it might be where there's a lot of traffic. Maple Street coming from Beech Street; west side Main Street, whatever.

Deputy Simmons stated I would agree that educating the public and getting that Crimeline number out there is always a positive approach to having people call in. I would venture to say that a lot of the people that have this type of information on a regular basis probably know the number already. But certainly advertising...recently Sargent Doughty's been on the radio several times. He does a public service announcement. He'll do a Crimeline of the week, and that's on the airwaves on a regular basis, where he'll advertise a number and suggest it. Every week there's a crime of the week that's put out to the press. Certainly

educating the public and getting that out there would always be positive, whether it be in the form of signs or public service announcements or what have you. Certainly that would make sense. I could pass that along to the Board who oversees the Crimeline.

Chairman Osborne asked what is your feelings about increasing the fee for the find?

Deputy Simmons responded right now what they do is they use a point system to determine what factors will be involved and how much will be paid, depending on what the crime is.

Chairman Osborne stated but just the figure \$5,000 rather than \$2,500, would that entice anybody more to...

Deputy Simmons stated I'm not sure. I guess it would depend on the circumstances. I think for somebody that maybe doesn't have a lot of money, \$2,500 is certainly a lot of money to pass a tip along. No matter what tips we have, it still requires a lot of investigation. There are times that...on the Board we have a Deputy Chief, at this time it's Captain Lessard. Sargent Doughty is also on the Board. So we've come to the Board on a regular basis asking for more money for a particular incident in which we're trying to gain more tips, and they've been very approachable in that regard. The Board's been very positive in giving us more money for different tips. So it is reviewed. But I certainly can pass those sentiments along to the Board for consideration.

Chairman Osborne asked Deputy Leidemer, how do you feel about it?

Deputy Leidemer responded I agree. I'm not sure. As Deputy Simmons alluded to, it's actually run by a separate committee. It's not governed by the Police Department. We work with the Board to do that. And I don't know when, but I think it was rather recent that they raised it to \$2,500. And we have gone to them on several occasions for high profile crimes where we were struggling for information, and they've always been receptive to help us. I think conceptually what you're saying is great, but I think that's something that perhaps we could sit down with the Crimeline Board in its entirety and address that and discuss that with them. But almost every document that we generate, be it a press release, crime of the week, the Police Blotter that's in the Union Leader, I believe all of those at the bottom have the Crimeline information and Crimeline number. And, as we speak, we have a group of individuals over at the Police Station that have volunteered to... we solicited and they agreed to become volunteers for us. And when we leave here, we're going to go back to the Police Station and speak to them about something similar, how they can help us in the community, not just as

volunteers at the Station, doing some of the administrative things, but actually be advocates for us in the community.

Chairman Osborne stated what I'm trying to say is, the \$2,500...if you see \$5,000 on the sign, or whatever, it makes a little difference. But the whole thing is here is we're not trying to spend money, but when's the last time you paid out \$2,500?

Deputy Leidemer stated Alderman, I guess what I'm trying to say to you is, we think that's something that deserves some discussion, but we can't speak for the Board. But we will bring it back to them.

Chairman Osborne stated but I'm just saying it's just that it's something to motivate. It's a motivation. Not so much that we want to spend the extra \$2,500 or whatever.

Alderman Roy stated a question for the Chair or the Deputies, whoever wants to answer it. The signage. Who's purview are those under? Are those bought by the committee or are those bought by the City?

Deputy Simmons stated the committee picked the signs that are out there now. I believe they utilized some designer to create those signs. And they pay for it out of the funds from Crimeline.

Alderman Roy stated so the seized assets, I suppose would be a good...Where do they receive their funding from?

Deputy Simmons stated I believe their primary funding for Crimeline comes from their once-a-year golf tournament. That's where most of their funding comes from. They do receive private donations along the way.

Deputy Leidemer stated a separate entity. They hold their own fundraiser. We have the document in front of us, the brochure. It's their golf tournament.

Alderman Roy stated okay, I would definitely support the Chairman that if when you meet with their full Board, if you could suggest to them additional signage and an increase in the advertised amount or their message out to the public. And if there is a way that we can help them at this level, I think we should express that.

Chairman Osborne stated I did call traffic today to get a price on what each of one of those signs would cost, but I didn't get a word back, but I will.

Alderman Roy stated I'm sure it's pennies versus what good they do.

Alderman O'Neil asked could we shift to a quick change in topic here? It's on the list.

Chairman Osborne stated okay. I'm just going down the list here.

Alderman O'Neil stated the two items are back to back, related to the School District, the first one being the School Resource Officer and the second...

Chairman Osborne stated I was just going to get into that, Alderman O'Neil.

Alderman O'Neil stated this is actually dealing with people and getting results.

Chairman Osborne stated we're not done yet. I was going to do that next, the SRO's. It's right here.

Alderman O'Neil stated one of the things you look for when you watch some of the School Board meetings is measurable results. And I'm not sure, with the work that School Resource Officers do with the DARE program, that it's measurable. We don't have somebody taking a test and saying you succeeded. Certainly in the DARE program and certainly Alderman Shea is probably very familiar, they probably had it many of the years at his school at Hallsville. Any positive influence that the police can leave with a young person...and it may not hit home that year; it may be many years later...I think is very important and with the School Resource Officers, my understanding is they were working cases and many of those cases were related to activity either with the school or students at the school. One of the things I remember coming up previously was, there were concerns that police officers had to leave the building. And I think, wasn't that all an IT issue, that they couldn't hook up to somehow connect to the Police Department to do reports, etc.? Am I correct or incorrect with that?

Deputy Leidemer stated it's not exclusively limited to that. That was part of the issue. In fairness to the School District, I think that has been resolved for the seven positions - offices or work areas - where the officers have been assigned. What can't be lost in all that is, those cases are generated either by the students being in the school or students of a school in related activities. And that takes them outside the school to investigate those. They perhaps have to go...they've been suspended...they have to go to their house. They have to go talk to a juvenile probation officer or testify in court about that. It's not limited simply to the school building.

Alderman O'Neil stated can I ask you, do either of you happen to know if there was a full understanding, or expectations, of what this School Resource Officer does?

Deputy Leidemer stated I don't have a definitive answer to that but what I can tell you is, since the August 8<sup>th</sup> BMA meeting, we have met with the School District Administration, and it's my understanding – I don't know the date – but Lieutenant Riley, who oversees the Juvenile Unit, which the SRO's fall under, is scheduled to appear before a subcommittee of the School District. And it might be tonight, but I'm not sure of the date.

Alderman O'Neil asked and will that be both on...they've agreed to have the SRO's, they funded the SRO's at three high schools, and they're looking for funds for the middle schools. Is that correct?

Deputy Simmons stated that's correct.

Alderman O'Neil asked and has there been any discussion about the DARE program? I know that Dare encompassed a little beyond that.

Deputy Simmons stated I don't believe there's been discussion on the DARE at this time. The SRO's is the one they concentrated on.

Deputy Leidemer stated and I don't think the meeting is restricted to funding for the additional position. I think it's to allow an opportunity for dialogue back and forth to get a true understanding of what the responsibilities of the SRO's are and the actual duties that they perform for the schools.

Alderman O'Neil stated as we said at the last meeting, we really need the School District to be a partner in the big picture on this. Anything we can do to help encourage that...it would be nice if the School District would appoint kind of a liaison that, if we need to have some discussions here with members, somebody from the School District, that that person could be available to us.

Alderman Shea stated I know that in reference to the DARE program, I think the mayor is looking for private funding for that. That's what he mentioned at the meeting. As far as the SRO's are concerned, I think that the problem it seems to me is probably the role of an SRO has not properly, in my judgement, been defined. In other words, I'm not sure who the definition for their responsibilities has to come from. But I think that part of problem that I see is that the SRO probably at one school does a certain amount of work, depending upon maybe what their obligations...what comes forth from that particular school. And then, depending upon what the role of the principal or assistant principal might be, and I think that that's part of the confusion, because I think that, in watching the programs, as we all do in terms of trying to get educated, I think that it has come up that a lot of times the SRO has not really been available for the school

personnel. And therefore they may be doing things that are probably related to school functions and responsibilities, but then again, they may not have been and they have been called out to do certain roles that they have been probably summoned to do. So that the school is saying, in essence, we're paying for someone to be there but they're not there all the time. And this has come up repeatedly at discussions that I've heard from School Board members. And I think that that's part of the problem as far as...

Deputy Simmons stated you are right in some respects. I think there's been some miscommunication over time. I can tell you that since the SRO program began, it's evolved to what it currently is. Almost every year we have to have a meeting with different administrators at the School Department, just to go over things. Lieutenant Riley or Sargent Farro, on a regular basis meet with a new principal of a school to identify what those responsibilities of the SRO are. With that is, you get a new principal who...the SRO is working fine in that school...a new principal comes in and has different thoughts and ideas. So it works in that direction as well. And I think the Juvenile Division Supervisor has done a good job at trying to keep communication open. That being said, as Deputy Leidemer mentioned, Lieutenant Riley will go before the School Board because it was identified that they've heard different rumors, or don't have quite the understanding we'd like them to have as to what the role is of the SRO, what we charge and why we charge it, on a charge back to the School Department. And we hope to resolve some of those miscommunications.

Alderman Shea stated I think that part of the responsibility is with the school itself, because I think that an SRO that comes into a school and wants to do a particular job and becomes aggressive in terms of trying to fulfill that, may at that particular school do things that may not be germane to that person's role. I mean, they're not trained to do it, possibly. They're not experienced as a result of maybe not training or education or what have you. I mean a police officer's role is to prevent crime but also to familiarize themselves with the situations that might create problems within a situation, so I think that if the School Department could sit down and decide themselves what they want the SRO's to do and then the Police Department, on their hand, also sit down with the officers and with the school and say, well, you're asking us to do things that these people aren't capable of doing. In other words, they're not trained to do that. This is a guidance counselor's responsibility, or this is an assistant principal's responsibility. And we also have people that sometimes shirk their responsibilities and push things off to people and say, You can do that, can't you? You can do this, can't you? You know how that works. Obviously then, the officer in one school is doing ten times more than they should be doing, and the other school, ten times less. That's where the inconsistency becomes...

Deputy Simmons stated and some of these issues you bring up are ones that we've had in the course of meeting every year. It's not new.

Deputy Leidemer stated Alderman, all of what you just said is why we appreciate the School Administration affording us an opportunity to meet with the Committee, to iron this out and have a more clear understanding from both sides where the duties and responsibilities are.

Alderman Shea stated and that goes back, unfortunately, to what Alderman O'Neil was saying initially about when you folks meet on August 30<sup>th</sup> that everyone's role has to be properly defined. That comes in at any situation, whether it be the one we're discussing, the one you're going to be involved in, the one we are. You know, so thank you.

Alderman Long stated and also the communication. Watching these School Board meetings, it appears...I mean it's understandable if the SRO has to go to court. There's nothing you can do about that. That's their responsibility. But maybe the communications...because from what I'm hearing, or watching, it's they don't know where the SRO is. I think that's half the problem. If the SRO's in court, that's certainly an understandable issue, or investigating a child that's been suspended, then that's certainly understandable. So, once again, just detailing those issues to tie it into a neater knot where everybody knows what their responsibility is and everybody knows what the other one is doing or where the other one is at.

Chairman Osborne asked anybody else on the SRO's? Let's bring in the DARE program. Anybody on that?

Alderman O'Neil stated I know the Mayor is going to attempt to try to do this with the private sector, but if he doesn't succeed, is there a game plan from the School District side or partnering...and I think that's important, whether it's the SRO's or the DARE program. It needs to be a partnership between the City and the School District. And, you know, I'm optimistic that the Mayor's office will be successful with getting the private sector involved, but if they don't, I just throw it out to the Administration. Is there a game plan?

Deputy Leidemer stated currently, if we don't receive funding, a source of funding, be it from the business community or the School District, there aren't any plans, as we speak, to re-institute the DARE program.

Alderman O'Neil stated the third source, if I may, Mr. Chairman, the third source could be that we could decide to pick it up on our side.

Deputy Leidemer stated another source of funding...if we don't have a funding source, currently there aren't any plans for this school year to re-implement the DARE program.

Alderman O'Neil asked could you provide for us, based on the last year it existed, just what the costs are?

Deputy Leidemer stated certainly.

Alderman O'Neil stated because it's salaries – I don't know if there were two or three Police Officers...

Deputy Simmons stated the curriculum has changed. When the program was in effect at the time, the curriculum was the old curriculum. We had all four...I believe there seven, actually, people involved in the DARE program. Four of those were the SRO's in the middle schools and then we had three full-time DARE officers during the school year. In talking with Sargent Doughty, the way the curriculum has been set up now, which was changed about a year ago, we could probably do that with two officers. I'd want the Board to understand that. That's two officers that right now we're using, doing other duties. They'd have to go back into the schools for nine months of the year to do the DARE program.

Alderman O'Neil stated but I think that financial information would be important. In the other sense, if we did find some funds on the City side to fund those two positions and we thought that was a worthwhile effort, those Police Officers are available to do patrol duty the three months of high vacation and that, as you used them before. So it can be a win-win for us.

Deputy Leidemer stated just so we're clear, in addition to the salaries, there's also school materials, notebooks...

Alderman O'Neil stated whatever it was, or what it would be if we did it next year. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Osborne asked did you find this program effective, DARE?

Deputy Leidemer stated to be honest with you, there's two schools of thought. Deputy Simmons touched on it briefly that the DARE program has recently undergone a change in curriculum. And I think that, logically speaking, if they change their curriculum, it's perhaps because maybe they didn't think it was effective or it wasn't as continuously effective as it had been in the past. In speaking with Sargent Doughty, along with Gary, we've determined that they have taken steps in a different direction. The State still subscribes and has a DARE

Officers Association, so we're confident that if we receive the funding source and we have an opportunity to assess the curriculum, that the possibility or the probability is that we would be in favor of bringing it back.

Chairman Osborne asked if you had a choice between the two – the SRO's and the DARE – which one would you choose?

Deputy Leidemer responded SRO's.

Alderman Shea stated I know that at one time of course the DARE program consisted of going to either grades K through Eight or K through Six. And now it's K through Five in the elementary – or maybe it was just...

Deputy Leidemer stated it was fifth grade and at the tail end it changed to sixth grade, but it's only for one school year – it's either fifth grade or...not currently, it would be sixth grade.

Alderman Shea stated it was sixth grade and now it would be fifth grade. Now, my question is, is it possible for Reserve Officers to conduct this program? In other words, a retired Police Officer who has worked as a DARE presenter, to possibly work within the school framework?

Deputy Simmons stated yes, that would be possible. You'd take a Reserve Officer and you'd certify him in the DARE program. And once he's certified, he could do that.

Alderman Shea stated that would be a substantial savings, I would assume if, again, you didn't have to use an officer who is paid a full year salary and so forth. You're looking for ways to employ Police Officers that Alderman Lopez suggested. This could be one way if, in fact, and I'm aware of the fact that there are mixed messages and mixed feelings about the effectiveness of the DARE program. I know that. There were certain communities that felt that it did not perform what it should have performed. I think that there was really adverse effects in some instances. But my point is that if you are planning on exploring the expenditures involved and obviously maybe you should come back too with how much it would cost if Reserve Officers that are not full-time in the Police Department but could qualify because of their experience as presenters to the children.

Alderman O'Neil asked am I correct, and I don't know if this was at the tail end of before DARE was phased out, but wasn't the Officers that served that function actually doing three different programs in the schools: DARE, there was a gang program for a little bit older – the middle school kids? And I don't know if that's

something the SRO's picked up. And then there was the old legendary – and one of you two could have been Officer Friendly at one point in your career, but it targeted the very young kids to talk about...which was also...I remember having one of my nephews with me one time, and I said, Say hello to Officer Cavanaugh, and he said, That's not Officer Cavanaugh, that's Officer Friendly. So there was an impact with that and that was for the younger kids, I believe. So it was more than just the DARE program is my point.

Deputy Leidemer stated the four SRO's in the middle schools provided the DARE education program. The three full-time Officers that fell under Crime Prevention conducted some DARE classes, conducted the GREAT program – that's what you speak...the Gang Resistance Through Education and Training and also the Officer Friendly. The GREAT program – I don't have the date – but some time ago that fell by the wayside. Nationally, we felt that we were getting the feedback that it wasn't that successful. We continued the Officer Friendly program until we did away with those positions. We still offer Officer Friendly services. It's one Officer who has a number of duties in the Crime Prevention unit but he also does, in the early stages of the school year, Officer Friendly.

Chairman Osborne asked where are we for the Weed & Seed of the West Side?

Deputy Leidemer stated I don't have a definitive answer for you. In reality, I misspoke when I provided documentation that it was funded through the United States Attorney's Office. That's incorrect. It's actually funded through the Department of Justice and funneled through the US Attorney's Office, but it's not United States Attorney funds. It's from the Department of Justice. The program itself...the other information contained in the analysis is correct. We've been told, that once you apply for it and submit the application for a geographic area, and you're approved, the monies are dedicated for that geographic area. You can't expand the geographic area. I'm not saying it's a probability or even a possibility, but we're going to revisit that issue with the Department of Justice, through the US Attorney's Office to see if that can be modified and we can expand the geographic area. That would be one, but we're also going to try and see if we can develop a similar Weed & Seed program dedicated to a different area of the City.

Alderman Roy stated the letter from Deputy Simmons to Alderman Gatsas on the synopsis...first, if we could have the same report sent to Alderman Gatsas sent to the Committee, or at least myself. I'd like to see the entire breakdown with the W-2's, minus the names, just so that we all have the same information. But according to that, the Weed & Seed so far is \$33,348?

Deputy Simmons stated let me get that out. Yes, that's a breakdown of the overtime that's associated with that grant.

Alderman Roy stated and then the number below the total of \$77,886 – that is the salaries, regular salaries?

Deputy Simmons stated that is correct. That's funding for two. That's one for our Weed & Seed Officer in the neighborhood, and it also funds the Weed & Seed Coordinator, which is a civilian position.

Alderman Roy asked would the Weed & Seed Coordinator be able to take on another officer in a similar program with the same exact mission on the West Side on a half-year basis?

Deputy Simmons responded I'm not sure I could answer that at this time. The Weed & Seed Coordinator...the Weed & Seed Program itself is quite intricate actually. There's a variety of things this program does. And I know she's involved with a lot of things, to include training. She goes to various agencies, other than the Police Department, and does similar types of training or other types of educational stuff along those lines. So I certainly need to speak to the Weed & Seed Committee to say exactly whether she could take on both tasks.

Alderman Roy stated okay. I would definitely support, as Deputy Leidemer said, a similar program. If we can't get the funding or permission to expand the geographical location, that we go ahead and self-fund that program on the West Side. It seems to be effective. It seems to be well publicized. Do you concur with that?

Deputy Leidemer responded as stated in my analysis, we think it's a very valuable program. We would like to see it expanded. We understand if it can't. We understand the parameters of our application, what we initially applied for, but we would certainly like to see a similar or a duplicate program in another area of the City.

Alderman Roy stated ideally I'd love to see some other entity pay for it, but if it can't be done that way then I'd definitely look for us to step up to the plate as a Board of Mayor and Alderman.

Alderman Shea stated I just wondered, does the Weed & Seed Program, we'll say on the West Side, do they need a centralized area? I mean, right now the Weed & Seed in the East Side, of course, uses the old St. Cecelia's Hall for some of their functions. Would the West Side be able to be implemented just by having, we'll say personnel, or does it need a site over there that you have to locate?

Deputy Leidemer stated it doesn't need a specific site. It needs the availability of a site. We used the MCRC Center; we used the PAL building. There's a number of venues, if you will, in the geographic area that we can use. That's not part of the application process that 'you will use this location for your meetings.'

Alderman Shea stated well no, but if you were to include the West Side, and again, I'm for it, do you need to have it on the West Side, or do the children from the West Side go to...

Deputy Leidemer stated no, the program would be restricted to a particular geographic area. I keep saying – another area of the City. If it's found that after an analysis that in assessment that the best area would be a certain geographic area on the West Side, that's exactly what we would do. Part of the actual Weed & Seed Program, you identify an area.

Alderman Shea stated and then from there you would have to find the necessary site in order to conduct the activities.

Deputy Leidemer stated more than one.

Alderman Shea stated it just involves kind of a...not just personnel, it involves other related situations.

Deputy Leidemer stated it would be similar, a duplication of what we did on the East Side, but a different geographic area of the City. Alderman At-Large O'Neil reminded me it's the Police Athletic League.

Chairman Osborne asked how about the additional community supported police substations?

Deputy Leidemer stated we support, as I said in the analysis, we certainly support that. I mentioned that we had a meeting with potential volunteers this evening to not only draw them in as volunteers to help us with administrative tasks but also reach out to them to become advocates for the Department. We currently have three substations; we have twelve neighborhood watches. We also have identified three other areas for neighborhood watches that are on board. And we support doing that, but we've got to get the community involvement...it has to be sustained involvement. You can't just open up a substation and, because it's a novelty for that particular area, everyone volunteers and wants to spend their time there, and a month later the volunteer hours dwindle, and it doesn't serve the purpose that it was intended. So we have to identify an area, we have to recruit volunteers, and we have to sustain their efforts.

Chairman Osborne stated I had somebody that contacted me that wanted to get in on that.

Deputy Leidemer stated they should be at the Station at seven o'clock tonight.

Chairman Osborne asked so what time are you supposed to be back there?

Deputy Leidemer responded seven o'clock, but we're at your service. That's when they will be...we will greet them when we get there.

Alderman O'Neil asked can I just make a few points on that, Mr. Chairman? Number one, I think what's very important to the substations...we may have just opened, in your ward, the best location of a substation, and I think what makes it...Alderman Shea had a very successful one up in his ward, but I think we were renting or leasing the space...

Alderman Shea stated we were renting and it was, as he explained, it was very functional at first, but as time wore on, the volunteers, who were very capable and very willing, after a few years decided that they wanted to move on and there was not enough participation, and that's part of the problem. But we had to rent it at about \$4000 a year, I believe it was, or \$3,000.

Alderman O'Neil stated and something...I don't know if a motion would be appropriate tonight, but we need to come up with a long-term plan as we're doing City building projects, whether it's at a Fire Station or a City pool – whatever it may be – working with the Housing and Redevelopment Authority. I know we have substations at two of the housing communities in the City, but if they're doing other projects, they have other projects going on throughout the City...Neighborhood Housing Services, Southern New Hampshire Services. We should look at opportunities to partner to put a more permanent home for some of these substations. I appreciate what they did with the trailers over at Sweeney Park, but that's not a permanent home, and I think it gives off that appearance. Is there a commitment from the City? We need to find a permanent home for the West Side, as we needed to find a permanent home for Wilson Street. I think we found a permanent home for a good portion of the center city on Maple Street. That can serve a lot a different areas, but we need to make sure as the City, maybe even include the School District, as they're doing a project, if it happens to be in an area we'd like to have some police presence, we need to properly fund...and it's not big money because it's not a large space requirement. But work with all those agencies. I don't think we need a motion on that, but other cities do it. They build fire stations, they build community centers for the seniors right, you know, as part of it. We don't seem to do that here. We treat every project separately and

we need to start forming these partnerships for more permanent solutions on not only maintaining the substations we have, but expanding them.

Chairman Osborne asked would you think that it would be a good idea, what you're talking about, what about if we worked with the schools for something like this, whereas there's no rent – unless the School Department wants to charge us rent – but I think you're killing two birds with one stone by having a substation in one of the schools in different areas. Did you ever think of that one?

Deputy Leidemer stated I think that would present a logistical problem. Schools close at three, three-thirty, four, five – when all the students, coaching staff, faculty, leave. And I don't think they, and I'm not sure I would blame them, I don't think they'd be real receptive to leaving their building open...

Chairman Osborne asked to the Police Department?

Deputy Leidemer responded well, to have traffic to go in and out. We're not there.

Chairman Osborne stated I guess it depends on where it's going to be, what school.

Deputy Leidemer stated I strongly, strongly support heavy emphasis on the partnership with the community, but I think we have to think it through where we would put these additional substations. Conceptually, we absolutely support that.

Chairman Osborne stated how about more police grants? What's happening with that? You got a whole bunch of them?

Deputy Simmons stated as I said in my letter, right now between...some of these are older grants, but we have almost \$1.7 million in grant funding going on right now. Some of that's fiscal '06; some of it goes back to '05 and a little to '04. In the line items of equipment, etc. On a regular basis we research several websites for grants. We're working with the City Grant Coordinator. On a regular basis he sends emails out to several of the Departments, including us, touching upon different grants that may hit a certain Department that we may have an interest in, or health, or what have you. So, he's been pretty receptive to providing us with information. But on a regular basis we're constantly overseeing all the different websites for a variety of money.

Chairman Osborne asked what's that figure again?

Deputy Simmons responded right now, about \$1.7 million.

Chairman Osborne stated and the Citizen's Police Academy?

Alderman Shea stated I'd like to go back, if I may. One of the thoughts that Alderman O'Neil generated in my mind is, you know, we talk about substations and new Neighborhood Watches, but you know, my thoughts are, is the City ready to have a second Police Station? In other words, has the Police Department decided that maybe because of the type of community that we're now living in, that it would be more advantageous for the City to have a sub Police Station? Has that thought ever been germinated in terms of locating, we'll say some property, on the West Side of Manchester? This is not a new idea. This is an idea that was proposed I guess a few years back, but maybe it's time for the Police Department, the leadership, to come in to the Aldermanic Board and say, look, we need a second Police Station. We need to have a diversified Police Department so that we're not responding every other night to concerns that the Police have to be addressing on the West Side of Manchester. If we had a Police Department, a Police Station there, we wouldn't have to have so much problems. We would have a person like yourself in charge. You don't need a police chief there, but you need officers and you need leadership. Has that thought ever been discussed at the Police Department or by the Police Commissioners and so forth?

Deputy Leidemer stated I think what you're referring to, Alderman, is a precinct. We'd have Police Headquarters in a precinct in a particular part of the City. I can't speak for the...I have never personally and I don't know of any of our Administration speaking with the Police Commission about the issue. But I know that we have had conversations in the past about that idea and what we usually come back to is the budget. And I don't say that so much from a negative position. It's just, to have a precinct, it's literally what we have at our station, most of what we have at our station. And it has to be manned twenty-four hours a day. You have to have officers or civilian personnel there. You have to have people there to answer the phone; you have to have secretarial staff there to do the filing. Part of the legal division would have to be brought over there to do those things. And I think that that is something that needs a tremendous amount of study, not just discussion amongst the Police Administration about, is it time for a precinct? That has wide ranging ramifications, both perhaps pros for us in the community and some of the things that we could accomplish, but also cons to us and the community in some of the burdens that we would place on the community for that.

Alderman Shea stated when you consider that the Fire Department has different stations throughout the City, and the Police Department, where the burden of responsibility has increased a hundred-fold, we'll say, on your shoulders and other officers' shoulders, it seems to me that regardless, somebody has to sit down and

say, look, it's going to be a five million dollar project but if you don't come forth with the thoughts and ideas, it will never be actualized; it will never become an accomplished fact. You've got to sit down and say, this is what we, as Police Officers, need to have, as police leadership. And come in and say, hey, you know, we want this – and you examine it. It's not going to be accomplished, we'll say in one month or five months. You'll have opposition, but if you can point out, as the leaders of the Police Department, that this is a necessary part of protecting the community, I think that it would make sense. And we can talk about Neighborhood Watches; we can talk about Crimeline; we can talk about other things, but if the Police have an operation on the West Side of Manchester, the people over there will begin to utilize and begin to familiarize themselves, and the officers there who have patrols don't have to cross over four or three bridges. They're right there. Their cruisers are there. Their responsibilities are there. Now maybe it's an extra ten million, maybe it's an extra eight million. But still in all, grants are available. I mean, who's to say that you can't write some kind of proposal whereby you can pick up two or three million and the City contributes a couple of million and you have it done? I mean, that's the way I would reason. Just a thought.

Alderman O'Neil stated just to follow up on that, I think Alderman Shea makes a very valid point. I remember, this discussion has come up before and there was always...Manchester is in that fine line about whether we're a big enough city to do it. I think anything and everything can be on the table right now. We need to have discussions. Are there things we can be doing to do it differently that might make it better? And it's a very valid point. I happen to...last week I was out in Albany, New York, for work. I think it's a city about the same size population as Manchester – a little different make-up. It's a state capital. But out where I stayed on the outskirts of the city, they had a pretty good size police station, and it wasn't their main police station. Now, I don't know what they run out of there. They may run specialized units or something, but they had a...it was kind of on a main...one of the main roads, east/west, going into downtown Albany. It certainly, I think as Alderman Shea said...anything is worth looking at and putting on the table.

Chairman Osborne stated I think the Deputies can look into this and come back with something. But we're having a hard enough time trying to find substations and funding them – and we're talking about precincts.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't know that we've had a hard time funding substations. I can't remember a request coming before us, to be honest with you.

Alderman Shea stated and what's more important, I don't think that substations sometimes are...in other words, substations depend upon how individuals respond.

And a lot of people are scared. If a substation has the necessary people volunteering, but one of the problems that obviously people have is they become intimidated, and they don't want to participate as maybe we would like them to do. And so a substation or a Neighborhood Watch or anything else, is as useful and powerful as the people are willing to participate. And I think that we should think, not short term but long term. That's what I'm trying to think about.

Chairman Osborne stated sure, that's why I say we should get some figures or some other cities that have another precinct along with the main station. And what your population is and who they have manning these precincts and get a little study on it. That's fine. I think they could do that. Right, Deputies?

Deputy Leidemer stated we can take care of that.

Chairman Osborne stated how about the Intergraph System and Compstat? Anything new on that? It's just coming along, right?

Deputy Simmons stated the Intergraph System right now, the company's been in here for the last several months. They're working with both our committee and the Fire Department committee, as well as Information Systems. So, we're well on the verge of getting that system up and running. We're anticipating a start up date sometime in August of '07, I believe. It's a long process, but it will certainly be a successful one when we're done and we're looking forward to that. With that, Compstat will become a proponent of that, in that the Intergraph System will allow us a variety of information in a more user-friendly format than our current system does. With that, and I think Deputy Leidemer's letter touches upon that, is the Preventative Policing plan that we're currently utilizing and I'll let him speak about that a little bit because it does touch along the lines of Compstat.

Deputy Leidemer stated actually, most of what I could or would say we discussed on the eighth and we can revisit it if you'd like, but it was pretty much detailed on the eighth. If there's any interest in hearing it again or hearing some of the details of it...

Alderman O'Neil stated it's a targeted effort that you have going on, based on cost for service...

Deputy Leidemer stated the Preventative Policing plan, in the foundation of it is that we meet weekly with the head of each division and each unit in the department, and we exchange information across the table, if you will, at the meeting versus having it generated by computer statistics. And we support that, that's going to be a great thing, but right now we don't have the capability of doing it, so we're doing it with manpower. Each of the officers and unit heads

bring in their issues to us because the community will call SIU, if you will, our undercover officers or the Special Investigation Unit, and have a problem. They bring that to the table and we see from the patrol side, we see from the administrative side, detective side, how we can help them solve the issue that they have.

Chairman Osborne stated okay we can move along to the convenience store security audits. It's already underway, I guess.

Deputy Leidemer stated it is. I believe the letters...I know they've been drafted...and I believe we were going to parcel them out in phases so we wouldn't have too many business owners or landlords calling us at the same time, having to develop a waiting list for the security surveys, security audits. But I believe those letters...I know the letter exists and I believe the first round of letters have been mailed.

Chairman Osborne asked do you want to take up Captain Lessard's memo that we got this evening? Anybody on the committee would like to take that up or do you want to just table that until the next...

Alderman O'Neil asked am I correct Mr. Chairman...that's just a summary of his presentation he made?

Chairman Osborne stated special initiatives, yes.

Deputy Simmons stated that's just the summary that he provided you last meeting.

Deputy Leidemer stated it's because we were directed...Deputy Simmons generated a document that listed it from the financial side and had all the finances affixed to it and Captain Lessard was directed to actually touch on what the initiatives were.

Alderman Roy stated if I could request of the Deputies...just to continue... the two extra letters, mine and Eric Sawyers's, if we could get a...just like you did with the Mayor's office, pros and cons of those suggestions and maybe some costs of implementation. I would like to come out of tonight's meeting with at least, along with the Mayor's suggestion...it seemed to be supported the night of our meeting that we increase the complement by ten...at this point that we take some step forward. We've already taken the steps to increase reserve officers. A lot of these things are underway. The Police Department has been working on a number of issues, but I think we should at least make a formal motion to accept number one and increase the complement, and put that to the full Board on September 5<sup>th</sup>.

Chairman Osborne asked you're talking over a two-year period, right?

Alderman Roy stated phased in over a two-year period. That I believe would at least allow the Department to go out after this testing is done and to possibly advertise and to have another test scheduled for a few months out. Is that possible?

Deputy Simmons stated that would be our plan. Additionally, in last year's budget we did ask for extra funding in our advertisement line item - which was granted - for the purposes of going out more towards the Massachusetts area, New York area, that regional area which, on a regular basis is rather costly, so that's certainly going to allow us the opportunity to advertise out there a little better.

Chairman Osborne asked do you think it would be better to give it a little time here to get your complement together first before we get into something like this? You can't get your complement together as it is now, right?

Deputy Simmons stated we'll have five positions at the end of the month. So, of these 24 I'm not sure we'll fill that with this current 24 on the list, or we'll go back to an older list. So certainly to at least start the process would be something we'd plan on doing anyway, hopefully maybe for another hire in January. I'm sure between now and January we'll probably lose some additional officers.

Chairman Osborne stated that's what I mean. We just get five more in one year and five more in another.

Deputy Simmons stated that's just the way it works.

Alderman Roy stated personally, I'm tired of taking five steps forward and six back with retirements. And it seems like if we're funding the 215 but we're always light of that. I have no problem saying to you, let's look to make the complement 235, and if you get 215 on the street, we're better off than we are today. So my goal is to go ahead and get the right amount of police officers on the street.

Chairman Osborne asked if this was approved would this be earmarked for those particular ten officers or would that just be under the Police budget?

Alderman Roy stated I don't think at this point...we can't reopen the budget in the committee process.

Chairman Osborne stated not now but in the next budget.

Alderman Roy stated then it would be earmarked under the general salary and benefit line item.

Alderman Shea stated I want to revert back...Alderman Roy made reference to retirements. How much time does the Chief of Police or people who are responsible have...like does somebody come in and a month later can leave or...is there any time that an officer has before they...you know, in other words, does your Department have any time...can somebody leave say...somebody decides to wake up tomorrow and says, I've had it. I've been on the force 23, 24 years. I'm going to decide to move on. Do they submit that and two weeks later can leave? Is that how it works?

Deputy Simmons stated that can happen. I think when that usually happens, when we have a limited announcement that someone's going to leave is when somebody, an officer, might be applying for a job at another agency. They're going to leave Manchester. So sometimes that time frame is a little short. Unique, not to our department but every...it's not unusual for somebody to start talking about retirement and before you know it, half the building knows about it. Even though the formal letter of retirement hasn't been granted, everybody has an idea it's coming and we do a guesstimate on that based on people's years. Most people are pretty good about giving us a length of time before they do leave.

Alderman Shea asked and what is the length of time consist of?

Deputy Simmons stated it's not unusual for an officer to indicate he's going to leave in a month or so, or sometimes two or three months. Again, I think most of them are just people that are going to go to another agency. Sometimes it's driven by...an opportunity comes up at the last minute for an individual. Most of our officers that retire don't retire fully. They take on another position someplace.

Alderman Shea stated that's right. Basically, it depends upon opportunities outside of the Police Department, when an officer has enough time in place to...

Deputy Simmons stated we do have new hires, officers that we hire brand new, sign a three-year contract with us because of the training and the costs associated with that, so they are required to stay with us three years.

Alderman Shea stated but in other words it's...see I guess it's difficult because I think a teacher has to serve out the entire year so that if they...

Deputy Simmons stated but we don't have that.

Alderman Shea stated but you don't have that particular...

Deputy Leidemer stated we don't have that with the State retirement.

Alderman O'Neil stated Mr. Chairman, just a question. Could somebody walk in tomorrow and say they're all done Friday?

Deputy Simmons stated they could.

Alderman O'Neil stated there's nothing legally that could...

Deputy Simmons stated what happens with the State retirement, you usually have to give them a thirty-day advance notice of your intent to retire, so usually it doesn't take long for a us to learn that, and it's usually just through conversation. But yes, somebody could do that.

Chairman Osborne stated I'd like to take these proposals and put them on the table.

Alderman Roy stated I can make it in the... I wanted to have a little bit more discussion on it, but I can't put it in the form of a motion to send it to the full Board for September 5<sup>th</sup>...that we increase the complement by ten new officers, whether we want to phase it five this year and five next year, that we at least take that step out of tonight's meeting, and we make some proactive effort. We've got twenty-four being tested. The Deputies have said all twenty-four won't make it through. Let's set it up that we can have another test and actively go after more officers.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'll second that motion and then discussion.

Chairman Osborne stated okay discussion. How are we going to fund these five new officers a year? Kevin...

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't think he's particularly saying we've got to fund them right away. This has got to be part of the process.

Chairman Osborne stated that's why I'm asking the question. I don't know, just moving along here. If we were to put ten new officers on within the next two years, or five a year, where would the funding be coming from – out of the General Fund, right?

Kevin Clougherty, Chief Finance Officer, stated they're General Fund positions, Alderman. If you're talking about bringing some on this year, you've already got an adopted budget.

Chairman Osborne stated if we take that amount of money out of the General Funds each time, are they going to be earmarked for those five officers in particular or does it just go right into the Police Department's budget?

Mr. Clougherty stated it goes into their salary line.

Chairman Osborne stated so that can be used, not for five new police officers but for anything they want, similar to the School Department, right?

Mr. Clougherty stated the department head has certainly some management discretion to try and...

Chairman Osborne stated I understand. I just want to make everybody feel good here, the people listening and so on. Money's money. I have no problem with five new officers, or ten, or twenty.

Mr. Clougherty stated it's a resource allocation decision you have to make. Do you want to have three men on garbage trucks? Do you want to have two men in sweepers? Do you want to have a whole array of accounting clerks? Those are the choices you're making. You're making choices about where you're putting your dollars. And there's the limitation, how much you can raise through grants. There's a limitation to how much you can raise through fees. Certainly if you wanted to go out to a user fee type of approach rather than a tax approach, you can use that. But it comes down to how you're going to charge, who you're going to charge and what you're going to charge. And are the people that you're charging able to afford that? And you get to a point where you start to have an impact on your demographics. You're charging too much, some of your older people are going to relocate. And you may price yourself out of certain markets. It's all related. You have to make informed decisions about what you think the affordability is from the tax perspective and how you're going to allocate those dollars that you can raise amongst priorities. Is Police more important than perhaps some of the other things that you're funding now? Those are hard decisions that you're going to be forced to make.

Chairman Osborne stated I understand all of that. I'm just asking the simple question of the money.

Mr. Clougherty stated it's not a simple question, Alderman. The simple question is, where are you going to put your money?

Chairman Osborne asked can it be earmarked or can't it be?

Mr. Clougherty responded if you...when you say earmarked your talking about uniformed officers?

Chairman Osborne stated in other words, if you set aside a half a million dollars for five new police officers, let's say, and these police officers are not hired...

Mr. Clougherty stated you would be putting these dollars in the Police Department salary line.

Chairman Osborne stated so it can be put in and spent someplace else other than the five police officers at that time.

Mr. Clougherty stated certainly the Board of Mayor and Aldermen can give directives to the Departments to specify how they want to see things managed, but under the City Charter, the Department Head has the responsibility for personnel management, not the Board.

Chairman Osborne stated well that's up to the Board. I'm just asking the question so everybody gets enlightened about it.

Alderman O'Neil stated I do think this is an appropriate time to take some action. We're not going to hire five or ten additional police officers in this next fiscal year. That's the real world. But I think, I'm guessing the Mayor and the Departments will start their budget process for fiscal year '08, I think it would be.

Mr. Clougherty stated the last single year before a biannual budget, Alderman.

Alderman O'Neil stated that would be fine with me. Sometime mid to late fall those things are going to start, so if this Board is serious about in the next fiscal year putting more police officers on the street or in the Manchester Police Department, then we need to take some action now so that we're not going through this...the second week of June having this discussion. We're serious about it. I believe the Mayor is supportive of...he has indicated ten over the next two years. Maybe he'd be supportive of ten over next year. Let's work through that. But I think the Board needs to take a stand now about where we would like to go for the next budget year. Maybe we'll find some federal funds to help pay for it under...you know the old COPS Program was successful. It doesn't exist anymore, but we need to make a stand now on what we're going to do down the road. That's why I seconded Alderman Roy's motion.

Alderman Shea stated it's very complicated because we could add ten new officers in the next two years, but if you have ten retirements, you really need to add twenty officers rather than ten if, in fact, you want ten more officers, right?

Deputy Simmons stated we would hire twenty. With your formula we would hire twenty officers but in reality we'd be increasing the complement by ten. That's what...if we get approval to increase our complement that's certainly what our goal is.

Alderman Shea stated and I think that we're not talking specifically about adding ten officers in '07 budget. What we're talking about is making sure that there is the realization that we want to have Police Officers in Manchester and we need to make sure that everyone is on the same page. And that's, I think, the appropriate way to handle things. I mean, this is just words now. These are not realities. We're not going to go out and hire ten new officers in five or ten months from now. We're saying if you need officers now, hire officers that make sure your complement...if you have...I don't know...rumors around the Police Department that certain guys or women are going to retire within the next year or two. What do you anticipate that there will be in terms of retirement?

Deputy Leidemer stated Alderman, there's no way to anticipate. You can listen...

Alderman Shea asked how many retired this year?

Deputy Leidemer stated retired? I think seven. We hired seven and we had some leave.

Alderman Shea asked it that usual? Do you usually lose between five and ten officers every year? So you can sort of predicate your thinking upon the fact that at least five, possibly seven, will be retiring in '07, which means that if you add ten new officers, it's pretty difficult to keep your complement up because you're actually only hiring three.

Deputy Leidemer stated we're going to hire ten, but we're going to increase our complement by a certain number. We'll hire the replacements and then at the same time, we're looking to increase our complement. So instead of looking for seven, we're going to looking for twelve. – that seven that retired and five that hopefully we'll get to increase our complement. So we will be looking for twelve new officers.

Alderman Shea stated so numbers are kind of like lost in the process here when we say ten you're figuring ten plus two or three. And we're saying ten but it becomes

a little bit difficult to...it's a moving target all the time. That's what I'm trying to say.

Deputy Leidemer stated but the authorization to increase our complement gives us the goal and the opportunity to fill the replacements, then increase our complement.

Alderman Long stated Kevin, I certainly understand the focus on the tax base and then the affordability of what people can afford. But on the other side of that, what is that doing to the marketing of our City? How much money do we put into marketing our City? And when we have articles of these violent crimes happening, that also has to be a consideration, and also the tax base loss of those that are moving or possibly selling their homes to move out.

Mr. Clougherty stated as I said, Alderman, in my opening remark it's about priorities. If safety is the priority, which as perhaps it should be, you're going to have to allocate resources to that. But you do not have...and this is my point, unlimited resources, which means you're going to have to make hard decisions about what you're not going to do, or what you're going to do differently, in order to free up those dollars for this priority.

Alderman Long stated I could agree with that, but I believe on the 8<sup>th</sup> we set...I know myself I made it a priority, that safety would be...is my priority.

Mr. Clougherty stated for all the reasons you stated, it is such a ripple effect on the economy and everything else.

Alderman Long stated so I see this as also one of our investments.

Mr. Clougherty stated I don't disagree.

Alderman O'Neil stated Kevin, it's pretty simple. The people paying the bills want to feel safe. And if they think, through us, they need more police officers, they need more police officers. That's the priority. And that's from the people paying the bills.

Mr. Clougherty stated Alderman, I agree.

Alderman O'Neil stated I'm hearing that message loud and clear. They want us to take back the streets of Manchester, so it's a priority. We've got to figure out how we get there but it's a priority.

Mr. Clougherty stated I don't disagree, Alderman, and we are hearing that, but we're also hearing from people about their taxes and their tax burden and they want that balanced and that's what...

Alderman O'Neil stated Kevin, that's not what I'm hearing out there. They want to feel safe on the streets. They're not complaining about their property taxes. They want to know how we can get more police officers on the streets. That's what I'm hearing from the people around the City. I'm not hearing people complaining about their services and their tax burden. So I don't know where the Finance office is hearing that.

Mr. Clougherty stated Alderman, I'm saying you have to balance those things in terms of affordability. If you, as the elected officials, feel that taxing up for this on top of everything else is not a problem, then that's the policy decisions you're elected to make.

Alderman O'Neil asked could we cut down on something else, like some of the administrative side of the City?

Mr. Clougherty responded exactly, which we've been talking about for a long time. I agree with you on that one hundred percent.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was unanimously voted to recommend increasing the complement of police officers in the Manchester Police Department by ten officers over the next two years.

Chairman Osborne stated so we'll get rid of the ten police officers. And we'll table the rest of the proposals that we have here?

Alderman Roy stated one more request prior to adjourning? Deputies, at our last...the special meeting, we had a conversation regarding full time officers versus overtime hours paid. Have any reports been generated or any studies...

Deputy Simmons stated part of that was addressed a little bit. I know Alderman Gatsas was inquiring, based on the amount of money we had in funding for grants. So in that breakdown of the \$1.7 million, I provided how much of that is related to overtime, and that was like \$371,000. But you can see if you look at that breakdown, it shows the various initiatives that are out there. The comparison was is that that money is for special initiatives and for various things and so to take that money and provide that to full-time officers, you'd still have those initiatives and you'd have to gear those initiatives or assign those initiatives to those particular officers. So that wouldn't solve the problem of having that officer on the street on a regular basis, when he has to provide that initiative.

Alderman Roy stated I've always been taught not to disagree with a police officer but something like the Gang Interdiction: \$60,000; \$10,000 maximum per month. Now, I know most of our entry level patrol officers aren't making \$10,000 a month, so when we look at that program, if we were to take that program and designate two or three officers...

Deputy Simmons stated that money comes through the State and it's utilized for the funding initiative of overtime, specifically overtime for those special gang patrols that we have out there or the additional patrols. We call it Gang Interdiction, but it does a variety of calls out there. But that's specific to overtime. It's not to fund a police officer position or to increase our complement.

Alderman Roy asked are there any that are not specific to overtime? Do you see where I'm going here?

Deputy Simmons stated on the second page, after I broke down the overtime, I looked and I provided the grants that do provide salaries and benefits. If not 100 percent, at least a good portion of that. The first one up there is the grants to encourage arrest, that \$213,000. That's a two-year grant and that pays for the two DART Officers, which are domestic violence. It also pays for a victim advocate. Again, that's over a two-year program. The second one is the MHRA. That's money we receive from Housing and that funds the Officers that are in the Housing areas. The third one is, we call it the VAWERS, the Violence Against Women. That pays for a portion of a Domestic Violence Officer, as well as a Domestic Violence Advocate. The Weed & Seed, as I indicated earlier, pays for the Weed & Seed Officer, as well as the civilian coordinator which currently works out of Health. And the New Hampshire Drug Task Force is money allotted to us that goes into our revenue, but that pays for the undercover Officer that works for the New Hampshire Drug Task Force.

Alderman Roy stated now those Officers that are paid through those grant funds, are they counted into what is currently the complement of 215?

Deputy Simmons stated yes and no. It shows a complement of 215 but four of those are grant-driven positions and they're not funded in our budget and that's how we carry it on our complement. So, technically, City-funded, we complement for 211; four of those additional ones are grant positions. And then we have the civilian positions, which are grant funded. So, in theory, when these grants run out we either pick those officers up or we're not funded for them.

Alderman Roy stated and potentially lose four officers. You know me. I want to make sure everyone knows exactly what page we're on and what our dollars spent

are. I would like to see us up around 235 in two years, not at 225, so if we can get there, any help I can give you, I'd greatly appreciate, reciprocate.

Alderman Shea stated I was just wondering, Mr. Chairman, you mentioned about tabling...

Chairman Osborne stated I didn't know if this committee wanted to keep any of these on the table or do you just want to slide them all off.

Alderman Roy stated no, I think we keep them all on the table. And the Deputies have agreed to supply additional reports.

Chairman Osborne stated regarding your letter.

Alderman Roy stated and I believe Eric's lawyers.

Chairman Osborne stated he couldn't make it this evening, or Eric gave me a call and said he couldn't make it and he'd like to be here. Whatever he brings in, he likes to be here to explain it.

Alderman Roy stated and I think some of the things on his list as well as mine you're already doing.

Deputy Simmons stated we've had conversations about that.

Chairman Osborne stated so if we go along with that we can table the rest of these?

Alderman Shea asked what's the purpose of tabling these? I know that there were some items here that...are we going to discuss them again or are we going to get a report?

Alderman O'Neil stated some of these items they're supposed to get back to us on. Neighborhood Advancement Team...they've got a meeting coming up.

Chairman Osborne asked what's your pleasure?

Alderman Roy stated I figure we table them, then the next meeting we can bring them up again.

Alderman O'Neil asked are we going to bring them up or are we going to get reports? Update us maybe. Maybe report isn't the right word.

Alderman Shea stated if that would be the purpose, I agree with that. At least there's some logic to doing that.

Chairman Osborne stated we could put it back on the agenda, let it go and not table it. Whichever way you'd like to go with it.

Deputy Leidemer stated as I understand it, the reports that we're going to generate would be for Alderman Roy's crime prevention suggestions, as well as Mr. Sawyer's, and then come back to you with updates at the next meeting. Alderman Roy would also like to attend the initial meeting, and also revisit with the US Attorney – correction – revisit with the Department of Justice the Weed & Seed initiative.

Alderman O'Neil stated you may have by the next meeting updated information with the School District on the SRO's. I think anything that was presented you can update us on I think it would be helpful.

Chairman Osborne stated maybe Sargent Doughty could make it for the next meeting also so we can go over this Crimeline situation and he can explain it more in detail and we'll see what we can do with that. So that's what we'll do. We'll table the remainder outside of the ten new officers, which we voted on.

Alderman Roy stated I believe there was also a request of the Chair to update us with a report regarding the salaries and benefits, and naturally we'll work with them.

Deputy Leidemer stated we'll submit that when we generate the report.

On motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was unanimously voted to table the balance of the items, pending updates.

There being no further business to come before the committee, on motion of Alderman Roy, duly seconded by Alderman O'Neil, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee